

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Vol. V, No. 17

October 15, 1945

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Tug of Peace

THE hour we have long prayed for and yet dreaded has arrived. We are in the throes of making a peace. As these lines are written the high hopes awakened by the initial agreement upon the Charter are being chilled by a bath of *Realpolitik* as the foreign ministers of the victor nations quarrel among themselves. It is easy now to be cynical, or to wallow in disillusion.

Easy, but wrong, and rather stupid. We knew, or should have known, it would come. War does not give place to peace overnight. A vast amount of patience is called for—and wisdom.

To begin with, this is no time to renew theoretical debate about the possibility of any good coming out of war. The pacifist Christian may be inclined to say, "I told you so." This is hardly relevant. Christians who supported the war will not be convinced by any amount of grief occasioned by peace conferences that a victory of the Axis Powers would not have been immeasurably worse. And even an unexpectedly early achievement of postwar harmony would not convince the pacifist that the war was justified. So there is no point in renewing the argument on that issue.

Turning our attention to the conflict among the foreign ministers, we shall be able to understand it better if we recognize three elementary but reluctantly faced facts.

1. The struggle over power is not a wartime phenomenon. It is bound to continue as long as there are sovereign entities presiding over portions of the earth's surface. It is tremendously accentuated in wartime, but it continues in the intervals between wars. The end of hostilities is not peace. Real peace requires the transmutation of national sovereignty, and that is a spiritual achievement.

2. The United States is now deeply involved in the power struggle. This involvement was inevitable in the surrender of isolationism. We are still prone to look upon the kind of quarrel that has broken out among the victor nations as an alien thing, something beneath us. But now that our government has assumed a world role, we are staking out claims far beyond our borders and making demands that look to other nations very much as their doings have

looked to us. Our possession of the atom bomb does not help matters in this respect.

3. The Soviet Union, the focus of chief American concern, cannot possibly see the problem of world peace as we do. From the Russian viewpoint the major conflict in the world is economic, and as long as it dominates international relations there can be no stability in world affairs. To expect Russia to take our view of world politics is naive. She senses deep antagonism to her domestic regime on the part of the Western powers and may be expected to shape her policy in part upon that fact. This does not exclude the possibility of amicable trade and cultural relationships; rather it makes them the more important. But it does mean that until fear of being "ganged up" on if her economic system is removed, Russia may be expected to play a shrewd diplomatic game, both defensive and offensive. This is the price capitalistic countries pay for their inherent hostility to communism. The more conscientiously we hold our conviction in this matter the better should we understand the Russian attitude. Foreign policy among the Western nations has long been an instrument of economic policy. The State Department has been a gigantic legal agency to which American property interests have looked for protection of foreign investments. On our theory there is nothing sinister about that, so long as it is kept within reasonable limits. But we should not expect the Soviet foreign office to be any less zealous in the protection of the regime that prevails in that country. A bit of realism will be very useful, if we want to trade with Russia and to maintain amicable diplomatic relations with her.

Durable peace is a pearl of great price and it is probably to be found a long way up the road we are traveling. It will be a rough road. We need not expect diplomacy, including our own, to be made over in a hurry. Nor is anything to be gained by allowing the atom bomb to blow up all the work that has been done in laying a foundation for world organization. Its frightful possibilities must profoundly influence the tempo of any effectual peace efforts, but not in the direction of scrapping such instrumentalities as we have for collective action

among the nations. The problem of peace is intensified by the power that has burst over the world, but qualitatively that problem remains the same. It is time we recognized that fear of the horrible does not deter men from fighting, and that is well, for peace needs a nobler foundation than fear. If mankind has no greater devotion to the values it has discovered than can be sustained by fright, perhaps it is time uranium did its work on a big scale. It may even be argued that the fury of a malevolent

power will be proportionate to the magnitude of the destruction it may hope to visit upon the rest of mankind, securing immunity by doing it first! There will be no peace until nations want it more than they want the goods that a lucky military stroke can secure. In our generation, as in those that preceded it, the hope of peace lies in the regeneration of the human spirit—in creating an absorbing passion for the wellbeing of all men. That is the Christian task.

F. E. J.

The Future of the Church in the Philippines

E. K. HIGDON

THE worst time of the day was the evening hour. All our uncertainties and fears seemed to come to a focus as night closed in. Unanswered questions plagued our thoughts: Why have we been brought here? (No one knew.) Will we be questioned and tortured tomorrow? (No one knows.) What has happened to my husband? (No one knows.) Have the children been taken? Are they being cared for? Are they hungry? (No one knows.)

"Then in our questioning uncertainty we turned to One who knows all things and entrusting our future to Him we found peace and quiet. I said to my friends, 'Let us not be afraid of the end of the day. The coming of twilight means we are one day nearer home—maybe our homes here or maybe our home in heaven—which one does not finally matter for we are in His keeping.'"

It was Monday of Holy Week in the Knox Memorial Methodist Church in Manila. The speaker was Miss Asuncion Perez, former director of the department of public welfare of the Philippine Commonwealth Government. She was describing experiences in the dungeon of Fort Santiago, hell-hole of the Japanese military police, where she and her husband had been imprisoned in February, 1944, suspected of anti-Japanese participation in guerrilla activities. Her husband has not been heard from.

The experience of missionaries in internment have been widely publicized, but an intimate description of the final month in Santo Tomas gives us some conception of what the missionaries and others went through:

"Living on 500 to 1,000 calories a day has been our experience during the last six to eight months, and even before that, improper diet and insufficiency of food had been our lot. In a land where fruit, coconuts, sugar and eggs are abundant, our loyal Filipino and other friends, and even recognized agencies, were not allowed to send in these foods to

relieve our desperate condition. Like the Prodigal Son, we would have been happy to fill our stomachs with rice and corn, but even that was finally limited to less than one-half pound per day. . . . With no eggs or milk, meat only occasionally for seasoning, small amounts of vegetables to add to what our own gardens produced, it is little wonder that respectable people, again like the Prodigal Son, sorted through the garbage cans and even robbed our captors' pigs of their food."

Just two weeks after they were released from captivity, a group of seven missionaries, two Baptists, two Disciples, a Methodist, a United Brethren, and a Congregationalist met to do some post-war planning. Shells were bursting near them or screaming over their heads in Santo Tomas. They said,

"Make haste slowly.

"Hold a general conference and a series of conferences . . . six to twelve months from now, depending on circumstances. Included in such conferences should be: board secretaries, prominent ministers and laymen from various churches in U. S.; Filipino leaders; and missionaries.

"Work out a plan for the islands as a whole, and especially for certain sections, which would call for: (a) unification wherever possible of schools, training centers and all other work on a union basis; (b) all denominational plans to fit into the unified plan; (c) the formulation of a program for five years, 10 years and 25 years, so that all worthwhile proposals may be given attention and priorities recognized.

"Hesitation in regard to all individual projects or the reconstruction of former churches, agencies or institutions until studied in light of a plan for the whole archipelago.

"Extreme care in the choice of interim or permanent missionary personnel.

"Resuming any kind of activity . . . is going to be nearly starting from scratch. Problems, not only in regard to losses of personnel and property, but also staggering ethical and moral set-backs, are going to tax every effort that can possibly be made."

Some idea of the losses in personnel and property, referred to by the group which met in Santo Tomas, is given by Judge Francisco A. Delgado, one of the members of the Philippine delegation to the San Francisco meeting. He writes:

"As estimates now go, between 20 and 30 per cent of the pre-war population of the City of Manila has been slaughtered by the Japanese during their occupation of the city and more particularly upon their retreat. According to the early reports from the provinces, the wholesale murder and destruction of properties in other parts of the country has been more or less the same as in this capital city.

"Those of us who refused to cooperate with their puppet government (which means the very great majority of the people) and who would have nothing to do with them were continuously persecuted in every way. . . . Many of our women were raped and subsequently killed, while the men and children were massacred *en masse* especially during their retreat from cities and towns in the mountains. During their three years stay here, they have taken the best that the country had in foodstuffs, machineries, furniture, etc., sending many of them to Tokyo and what they could not send away or carry away in their retreat, they systematically burnt down or otherwise destroyed. Many of our men who refused to cooperate with them were put in prison, tortured and subsequently killed. Anyone suspected of being loyal to America and the Americans, or of having any connection with our guerillas were immediately imprisoned, tortured and finally killed. In a word we continuously lived in perpetual alarm and fear of incarceration and ultimate death, and were deprived of all the prerogatives of free men."

The destruction of property and the loss of life in Cebu and Iloilo, where 75 per cent of the buildings were destroyed, create problems in leadership and relief and reconstruction which have a direct bearing on the future of the church. Proculo A. Rodriguez, a Congregational minister, writing on February 28, 1945, from a small town on the island of Negros, tells of the situation in rural areas and unconsciously reflects the indomitable spirit which enabled Filipinos to resist:

"About eight months ago when Japanese propaganda was so strong and the people feared their mopping up operations in the mountains and so many people came down, I got so lonesome out in our home near the forest that the temptation to go down was very, very strong. Faith in the increasing strength of America held me back and that faith is now vindicated. How refreshed are our souls! We need not watch for 'alarm signals' any more. The people are cheerful and thankful.

"Food supply was and is always a problem though not so acute any more. A shortage of clothing is very conspicuous. Any strip of cotton cloth will

have many competitors any time. . . .

"Giving has increased way above what it used to be. The people are awakening. Of course, things are very expensive but all the same the sense of stewardship is more real than ever before. Before the war this church paid their preacher 30 pesos. Beginning January 1945, they started paying 70 pesos.

"Would that the plates of the American Bible Society are still intact. The demand for Bibles and hymnbooks is staggering—and they are nowhere to be found. It is my hope that free Manila will soon be able to print Visayan Bibles. It is very inspiring to meet with a large congregation from Sunday to Sunday and to have so many opportunities to preach the Word in home gatherings."

W. H. Fonger, agent of the American Bible Society in the Philippines, reports that although the residence and the storehouse were both destroyed, the vault in which the plates were kept came through intact.

Mr. Rodriguez refers to Silliman University families. In a letter written to a missionary member of the Silliman faculty who escaped by submarine and is now in the United States, a Filipino colleague says:

"The University Committee, which you appointed when you were here, met in my evacuation house last December. All the members were present. It was decided to start at once gathering equipment preparatory to the opening of the University which will be done as soon as the capital of this province is liberated. . . .

"The darkest period of the war has passed. . . . We hope that the time when men can again sincerely smile at each other and treat one another with brotherly love will not be long in coming."

It is evident from the statements quoted above (1) that the level of moral and spiritual life is higher outside the capital than in Manila; (2) that a large proportion of the mission and church property has been destroyed; (3) that many of the most effective servants of the church have died during the occupation, and (4) that the first task in the immediate future is to provide relief and rehabilitation to the personnel, and within two or three years to begin the reconstruction of buildings on the basis of an archipelago-wide survey to determine the most effective distribution of Christian institutions.

Two factors have a direct bearing upon the future of Protestantism in the Philippines. The first is the status of the new united church which has been organized during the war with the consent of the Japanese military authorities. The second is the economic future of the Philippines.

A brief summary of the Protestant movement is necessary to an understanding of the first of these problems. The Protestant church grew rapidly in the Philippines from 1898 to 1942. The 1938 census

reported 375,000 communicants and a million others who gave Protestantism as their religious preference. Furthermore, evangelical Christians wielded an influence out of proportion to their numbers. Both the growth and the influence were due largely to two factors, an evangelistic passion which caused missionary and national alike to preach for a verdict, and a strong spirit of cooperation which made possible an effective impact upon the total population.

The Evangelical Union provided channels for cooperation from 1901 to 1928. The delegates to the Jerusalem missionary conference held that year were elected under the auspices of the Union. The National Christian Council superseded the Union and served the churches and missions from 1928 until 1937 when the Philippine Federation of Evangelical Churches was organized. The Federation continued to function as an agency of the churches until sometime in 1942 when the Japanese, through the religious section of the military government, called together a group of Filipino churchmen to adopt a constitution for a new federation.

It is reported that the Japanese who presented the new constitution tried to make it appear that it was only tentative and subject to revision, but after several Filipinos pressed the matter repeatedly, the Japanese admitted that they did not want any changes in the document. At that point a young woman lawyer moved that the constitution be adopted without a reading and the motion was unanimously carried. This was one way of registering the conviction that they had no choice in the matter, a fact which may need frequent demonstration in the months which lie immediately ahead.

Before the war cooperation among Protestant groups led to the union of three denominations: the Presbyterians U.S.A., the United Brethren in Christ, and the Congregational-Christian. The new church, founded in 1928, was called the United Evangelical Church. Fifteen years later, in October, 1943, this church and seven other denominations issued a call for the formation of the Evangelical Church in the Philippines, all the uniting groups having had membership in the Federation organized under Japanese auspices and pressure. The official bodies of each of these denominations to which the call went were to decide whether or not they would respond favorably to it. When the time came to consummate the union in April, 1944, the Methodist church and the *Iglesia Evangelica Metodista en las Islas Filipinas*, an independent Methodist communion, had voted unfavorably on the proposal. But the Philippine Methodist Church, a denomination resulting from a schism in the parent Methodist body, was among the uniting groups. The Baptist church in the Philippines, the Philippine Episcopal church, and *Manga Iglesia ni Cristo*, which had been members of the Federation at the time the initial action

was taken, did not enter the merger. Neither did the Seventh Day Adventists who from the very beginning refused to participate in the Federation.

However, in his address to the First General Assembly, Dr. E. C. Sobrepena, who was later elected presiding bishop, reported that 700 congregations had united and that an additional 300 had entered into an associate relationship.

In a news letter published in July, 1944, Bishop Sobrepena reports two tours which he made following the first annual meeting of the Assembly. The Japanese military authorities had permitted him to go as far north as the province of La Union and as far south as the province of Camarines Sur. He had made no visits on other islands than Luzon. Dr. Sobrepena says the highlights of the northern tour were "the visit to Agoo, La Union, where over 5,000 people gathered to hear a message from the Presiding Bishop; a great revival in Caba, La Union, where over 300 members reconsecrated their lives to service, thirty-five persons decided for definite Christian service, and 50 people, including the mayor of the town and the principal of the provincial high school were baptized; . . . and the adherence of two new congregations to the Evangelical Church."

Bishop Sobrepena sends a copy of a radio address which he delivered on December 4, 1944, "upon the request of the Japanese Religious Section" and remarks: "Written during those days of pressure you will, I am sure, understand why some of the extremely polite words of (about) a very sensitive ruler (were used)." He speaks of criticisms of the new church and efforts to discredit it and asks that, "the other side of the story" be heard by those in America who have an abiding interest in the Christian movement in the Philippines. Bishop Sobrepena probably refers to such statements as these about the Japanese rulers:

"Filipinos of whatever creed are also grateful for the continuation under the present regime of freedom of worship and religion. At the outbreak of the greater East Asia war, one of the important reasons for many Filipinos participating in the armed conflict was . . . their desire to have the Filipinos continue to enjoy the civil rights they enjoyed under the Commonwealth, one of which is freedom of religious profession, which freedom was thought would be deprived them in case the Philippines would fall under Japanese influence. I am happy to state that we have not only been granted religious freedom, but have also been given assistance in our work particularly in connection with various problems confronting our ministers and members in view of the present difficult times which are a necessary concomitant of the present world war.

Speaking of the purpose of the new church to Filipinize the Christian movement, the bishop declared that Christian institutions and organizations

in lands like the Philippines had been too long "directed by policies formulated in foreign lands and manned and controlled by foreign missionaries. This is not speaking against Christian aid from Christian people like that being offered by our Protestant ministers of the Oriental Empire for that should be always welcome."

Justice tempered by mercy and love will be needed in large measure in order to resolve the tensions among various Protestant parties which have been separated geographically and psychologically by the war. That is perhaps the most difficult immediate task of the Church.

The future of the Protestant church in the Philippines depends in larger measure than most Americans realize on the economic arrangements applicable to the Filipino people at the time they attain political independence. The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, had assured Filipino government officials that independence would be granted even before the date set by the Tydings-McDuffie Act, July 4, 1946, provided the country had been liberated. President Sergio Osmena had suggested that full political freedom be announced on August 13, 1945, Occupation Day of the Spanish-American War, and Roosevelt, we are told, had agreed. But the end of political control should not mean the loss of all American interest and concern.

Professor Lloyd P. Rice of Dartmouth College, who served from 1938 to 1940 as economic advisor to the Philippine Commonwealth Government, states the situation in these words:

"Our concern is that the people of this country, and particularly all church groups, should be alive to our *moral responsibilities*, to see that the drastic economic readjustments necessitated in the Philippines should not lead to chaos, discontent, and the ultimate failure of our liberal colonial policy, whether by default, through the lack of support for necessary adjustments in trade policy on our part, or because of the recurring pressure of short-sighted, selfish interests in this country. We shall be held morally responsible for establishing conditions which will make a successful transition reasonably sure.

"As Christians we believe that the welfare of the common Filipino *tao* should be regarded as of more importance in the formation of our trade policies with them during the next generation than the assumed profits to American sugar producers or cotton and dairy farmers."

American churchmen can contribute to a prosperous, effective Protestantism in the Philippines by using their influence to secure just and fair economic arrangements with the Filipino people.

The Protestant movement in the Philippines is less than 50 years old. During the first quarter of a century of its history, it grew rapidly, and due, in

part, to its vigorous development and in spite of union institutions and cooperative agencies, many small groups sprang up either independently of those established by boards of foreign missions in United States, or as splits from those churches. However, two decades ago a mounting interest in church union found expression in the organization of a united church sponsored by three of the boards of foreign missions which had been responsible for planting them in the islands. A few years later a dozen of the independent denominations came together. And within the last three years, the Evangelical Church of the Philippines has come into existence, uniting groups which represent 40 or more denominations. A quarter of a century ago each of these denominations went its own way.

These developments point to a church in the future which shall be united. The principal responsibility for its life and work rests upon the Filipinos; but Christians from the West will labor with Filipino colleagues to give that church the world-wide character and universal tone which alone can make it an organic part of ecumenical Christianity.

The Atomic Issue

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

IT is important to understand the full dimension of the problem of the atomic bomb, before rushing forward solutions. Many proffered solutions have not taken the relevant facts into consideration. It is, for instance, not possible to lock the atomic bomb secret in a chest or to put it into the keeping of an international commission.

This is not possible because only a fractional part of the whole procedure, which brings forth the atomic bomb, is secret. The scientific principles, upon which it is based, are well known; and have been for several decades. The development of the bomb was partly achieved by the government's organization and collation of scientific knowledge and partly by the development of manufacturing techniques. The exact anatomy and structure of the bomb is of course a secret. But neither the extraction of uranium from the ore, nor the manufacture of the bomb is the kind of secret which could not be recapitulated by good scientists and technicians of any nation within a period of eighteen months to three years. Our possession of the "secret" of the bomb therefore gives us only a short range advantage. Furthermore it must be considered that actual work on the bomb has been done elsewhere (by the Germans for instance) and that residual results of their labors could be appropriated by other nations (Russia for instance).

One of the immediate issues facing us now arises from the fact that there is a general disposition on the part of governmental, particularly military, authorities to emphasize the exclusive character of our knowledge of the bomb while the scientists who worked on the

bomb (and also those who did not and are not therefore sworn to secrecy) are anxious to have the fact known that the secret is very limited. They are concerned about this matter because the scientists are filled with moral scruples about the possible destructive effect of the bomb in the future and are apprehensive lest the political use of the prestige of the bomb, in bargaining for short term advantages with other nations, may hasten another war; and may, in any case, negate every possibility of using the world wide fear of the bomb as an instrument for a better world order.

It may be mentioned in passing that another source of tension between the scientists and the government is bound to develop. The scientists are afraid that the complete governmental control of the whole field of nuclear energy will tend to discourage non-military objectives, such as the possibility of relating nuclear physics to cancer cure. On the other hand the withdrawal of all governmental supervision would lead to a chaotic struggle between the universities and large foundations on the one hand and between the universities and large industries on the other. The solution for this problem probably lies in a governmental agency of large proportions in which pure science will be strongly represented and will be armed with the authority to prevent the development of nuclear physics from becoming a mere instrument of military ordnance.

But this is a minor issue compared with the monstrous proportions of the threat of mutual annihilation with which the development of the atomic bomb has confronted the world. It may be worth noting incidentally that the humility and moral sensitiveness of the scientists who developed the bomb, proves that the atomic bomb heralds the end of one age and the beginning of another in more than one sense. For this humility proves that the era in which science assumed that all of its discoveries were automatically beneficent to mankind, is past. The scientists are beginning to understand how all the achievements of a technical age contain potentialities of evil as well as of good; and that sometimes the evil is more obvious and immediate than the good. The question which confronts us, is whether we can either abolish war so that this new dimension of destructiveness in warfare will not prove the undoing of civilization absolutely; or whether we can abolish the use of the bomb so that we may at least confine the destructiveness of warfare to the proportions, existing before the invention of the bomb.

One must report with something like dismay that neither of these objectives is easily attainable. Many organizations and individuals are rushing into print with proposals for the outlawry of the bomb. Some think that we ought to use our present advantage of the possession of the bomb for the purpose of persuading other nations to agree with us to a program of outlawing this new lethal instrument. In criticism of this proposal the following considerations must be weighed: (1) Past history of the outlawing of particular instruments of conflict (submarines, balloons, poison gas, etc.) does not encourage the hope of success. We have succeeded only in outlawing poison gas; and there is general agreement that we were successful in regard to poison gas only because poison proved to be strategical-

ly ineffective under the conditions of modern technical war for many reasons into which we can not enter now. (2) The outlawry of the bomb would require a rigorous international inspection system which would subject every physics laboratory and every mining operation and almost every type of factory to careful scrutiny. This very scrutiny would presuppose eventual conflict and would accentuate mutual mistrust. The report of probable or real evasions of either the letter or the spirit of the law by one nation might well fan present frictions and animosities into premature conflict. (3) No systems of suppression, which will seem politically feasible from the standpoint of the nations which now have the bomb, will appear to be perfectly reciprocal from the perspective of those nations which do not have it. This is true for the simple reason that it is not possible to put nations, which have the knowledge of the bomb on the same footing with those who have not, through any system of suppression. (4) Any system of outlawry would only guarantee that the bomb would not be used at the beginning of a major war. It would certainly not secure us against its use before the war was finished.

Because efforts to outlaw the bomb might make it more difficult to outlaw war, many students of the problem have come to despair of this objective, though they may have entertained it only a month ago. The question therefore arises: does the invention of the bomb hasten the day of a really effective world government, which will outlaw both war and the bomb by bringing the anarchy of international relations under the dominion of genuine law and effective order? If one answers this question without wishful thinking the answer can also not be too sanguine. Our situation is that the world is now organized under the authority of three, and possibly only two, great hegemonous powers. The United Nations Organization only slightly qualifies the sovereignty of these great powers and (if we may judge by recent history) seem not to have mitigated their mistrust of each other at all. Only a few months ago both Britain and America aspired to the role of mediator between the other two. But recent events have proved the futility of these aspirations. The world is in the process of division between the Russian and the Anglo-American complex of power. It would be easier to construct an international authority to maintain its dominion over ten hegemonous nations of fairly equal power than over two. The chasm between the two is deeper than it would be between the ten. And the power of the two is so great that no purely constitutional artifact can create sufficient power or authority to hold the two under its dominion. Moreover there is no immediate possibility of overcoming the vicious circle of mutual mistrust between the two, sufficiently to initiate the steps required for the creation of world government.

If the absolute outlawry of the bomb and the absolute outlawry of war are not possible goals for the next decades at least, what ought to be done? The only possibility which remains is that the policy with reference to the bomb would be so directed that it would tend to overcome and not to aggravate the mutual fear and mistrust which have developed between Russia and the western world. Such a policy could take various forms.

It might take the form of an offer to share the secret of the bomb, accompanied by a proposal for a reconsideration of all the issues between the West and Russia which now breed distrust. Sharing the secret of the bomb might mean the establishment of international laboratories in nuclear physics in which all scientific possibilities of nuclear physics would be explored, with the military possibilities neither emphasized nor suppressed. The policy might be even more simple and consist merely in making the secret generally available. Since it is only a short-run secret anyway, there are those who argue that we have little to lose and much to gain by such an offer.

While I am convinced that such an act of trust and generosity is more within the field of possibilities than either the immediate outlawry of war or the absolute outlawry of the bomb, I must nevertheless confess that this policy is also not within immediate political reach. Russian intransigence, particularly in recent weeks, has so sharpened animosities and increased apprehensions, that no government would dare to make such an offer or gain the support of the nation in making it. The fear of mutual annihilation ought indeed to persuade us that a very radical step is necessary to secure the survival of civilization. But unfortunately ultimate perils, however great, have a less lively influence upon the

human imagination than immediate resentments and frictions, however small by comparison.

Such considerations may well prompt the heart to complete dismay. One has to elaborate them nevertheless, merely as a matter of honesty. It is simply a fact that the introduction of a new and more lethal instrument of conflict into history at a moment when the world is only imperfectly organized, tends to accentuate its anarchy. But it is necessary to dwell upon the difficulties also as a matter of policy. For only a full understanding of the practically insuperable difficulties which confront us can arm us with the humility and the courage to seek for a solution of this problem radical enough to prevent the annihilation of civilization. It may well be that the final policy adopted will contain elements of all three alternatives. But no combination of alternatives will be effective if some method of bridging the gulf between Russia and the West is not found. Even the best possible policy might fail to overcome Russian mistrust and fear and the resulting drive for unilateral security on the part of Russia, which so exasperates the west. But an effort must be made or we are all undone. No ideal ultimate plan will help us if it does not take these immediate difficulties into consideration.

The World Church: News and Notes

World Council Secretary Urges Churches Back Government Relief Plans

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, has called upon all Churches to "back governments in relief plans."

Clarifying his attitude toward the UNRRA and the American Red Cross, he said that any criticism he had made of these agencies was meant to make clear that they "do not have enough support to meet the appalling needs about which the churches are concerned."

"No one in Geneva ever visualized government relief efforts as unimportant," he added. "In fact, they are indispensable and should be greatly increased. The World Council is convinced that in view of the immense need only governmental relief is truly adequate."

Voicing appreciation that the American churches have acted to bolster UNRRA appropriations in Congress, Dr. Visser 't Hooft declared the World Council of Churches is clearly aware that its efforts can be only supplementary to government and semi-government activities. "No one dreams of the churches taking over the whole incalculable relief task," he said.

"While governments will have to bear the main burden," he said, "the Christian conscience demands that the churches set up an organization to give what additional aid they can where they can."

"The inadequacy of present relief efforts seems obvious here in the center of Europe," he said. "In many areas of Europe the Church is almost the only going concern. Because of this chaos, the World Council's resolution emphasizes the role of the American Church in meeting needs."

Dr. Visser 't Hooft said the churches in America

must realize it is not enough merely to collect food and clothing and to send it to a port for shipment. The organization of distribution is a big and complicated task, he stressed, and for this reason such agencies as the International Red Cross were mentioned as possible collaborators in the project. (RNS)

German Church Plans Group To Deal With Russians

Creation of a secretariat to establish official relations with Russian occupation authorities was voted by the Supreme Council of the new Evangelical Church of Germany. The meeting was presided over by Bishop Otto Dibelius and attended by representatives from the various provinces under Soviet control.

Several prominent German pastors who speak Russian fluently were considered for leadership of the new bureau, but no decision was taken at the meeting.

The Council reported that no solution has yet been found for the problem of contacting churches under Polish occupation. It was stated that church officials who have approached the Allied Control Commission on this matter have been told to "see the Polish officials." However, the church group learned that there are no Polish officials in the American, British, Russian, or French zones of occupied Germany.

The most tragic problem of all, the council was told at the meeting, is that involving relief for churches and congregations of Eastern Germany. For months almost no salaries have been paid to pastors and no pension payments have been made to retired pastors and widows. Even if food is available from Western German congregations, lack of transportation makes it impossible to send supplies to the East. (RNS)

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOGH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary of Editorial Board</i>	

Moscow Patriarch Reports All Major Church-State Problems Solved

Patriarch Alexei, supreme head of the Russian Orthodox Church, announced that all major problems of church-state relationships in the Soviet Union have now been satisfactorily solved. He indicated, in an exclusive interview, that Premier Josef Stalin is taking a personal interest in the work of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The Patriarch described Stalin as "a great friend of all believers," and said he has "created the best possible conditions for our work."

Patriarch Alexei refuted charges made in some quarters abroad that Russian Church activities are controlled by the Soviet Government.

He said the Church's schools, theological training, priests and sermons "are not controlled by anyone except the Church."

Along the same line, the Patriarch intimated that the government is not attempting to keep youth away from the churches. He reported Russian young people are turning toward the Church and are "gladly cooperating with the clergy."

The Moscow church leader disclosed that 89 monasteries are now open in Russia, and that others will be opened later.

"The problem of our times, however," he added, "is that so few wish to dedicate themselves to the monastic life. We view the monastic life as asceticism. The modern world has moved far from this, so we must be absolutely certain that people will come to the monasteries to devote themselves to the service of the Lord rather than to seek to escape life's hardships."

Stressing the desire of the Russian Church to unite under its authority all Russian Orthodox congregations abroad, Patriarch Alexei announced that he will shortly send representatives to Germany, Czechoslovakia,

Manchuria, Shanghai, and Japan. His delegate to Germany will be Archpresbyter Nikolai Feodorovich Kolchitsky, manager of the affairs of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The Patriarch discounted reports that Eastern Orthodox churches in the United States are planning to merge into a single American Orthodox Church under the control of the Moscow Patriarchate. He said:

"We have sent Archbishop Alexei of Yaroslavl to the United States to bring about the reunion of all Russian Orthodox churches in America under our authority. Other Orthodox churches in America—the Syrian Church, for example—are not affected by these plans and will remain connected with their own patriarchates."

Alexei praised the American people and declared that "together, fortified by our belief in the Lord and benefiting by his blessing we must create a peaceful, satisfactory, plentiful life for all. The Church can be a great factor in establishing the reign of justice. Our Church will do its utmost for peace, security, and contentment. May all others do likewise." (RNS)

Clergyman Reports on Impressive Activity of German Church

Reports of "impressive activity" by the Evangelical Church of Germany in rebuilding its own organization and cooperating in national recovery were brought to Geneva by the Rev. Stewart Herman, staff member of the World Council of Churches, who has completed a 3,000-mile tour of Germany.

Herman said the Evangelical Church is taking an important part in communal life by handling relief information and organizing postal and other services normally carried on by the provincial governments. The same type of activity, he stated, is conducted by the Roman Catholic Church.

Reporting that relations between German Protestants and Catholics "were never better," Herman said:

"In two provinces, a written agreement exists between the two faiths for exchange of information and welfare services."

He disclosed that a meeting of Evangelical church leaders in the Russian zone has been called by Bishop Otto Diebelius of Berlin. Steps have also been taken to convene a conference of interdenominational foreign missions secretaries to clarify the position of the German churches on international church problems.

Herman announced that the World Council of Churches is being recognized as the principal agency to handle visits to Germany by American and European churchmen which will begin next month. (RNS)

Author in This Issue

Elmer K. Higdon was formerly a missionary in the Philippines and is now secretary of the Missions Board of the Disciples of Christ Church.

Rev. N. M. Simmonds
1324 Gallatin St., N. W.,
Washington 11, D. C. 936 6-46

We are sorry that our October 1st issue reached our subscribers a week late. The elevator strike in New York City was the cause of the delay.